



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,406	08/22/2003	Tsung-Liang Lin	251316-1770	9248
24504 7590 08/20/2008 THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E. STE 1500 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994				
EXAMINER				
DEPPEL, BETSY LEE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2611				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/646,406

Applicant(s)

LIN ET AL.

Examiner

Betsy L. Deppe

Art Unit

2611

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 14-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 14-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 19, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 19, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. In response to applicant's argument on page 10, first paragraph that the diplexer 36 in Isley is "used only for receiving signal" and "no related description discloses, teaches or suggests that the diplexer 36 can transmit the signal to the antenna 14," Isley, Jr. et al. describes passing a signal through the transmit side of the diplexer 36 and steering the transmit signal toward antenna 14 (see column 5, lines 47-50).
4. In response to applicant's argument on page 10, second paragraph that "the half duplex operation cannot be applied in dual direction signal transmission," it is well-

known in the art that half-duplex operation applies to dual direction signal transmission. For example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Half_duplex defines a *half-duplex* system as providing communication in both directions (i.e. "dual direction signal transmission"), but only one direction at a time (not simultaneously).

5. In response to applicant's argument on page 10, third paragraph that the claimed digital circuit processes only digital signals, Figure 1 of Isley, Jr. et al. shows a digital signal processor 37 (i.e. a digital circuit) which processes only digital signals.

6. In response to applicant's argument on page 11 that neither Antoniak or Isley, Jr. et al. provides a motivation for using separate grounds, Robinson et al. teaches using a separate analog ground and digital ground. Therefore, the combination of Isley, Jr. et al., Antoniak and Robinson et al. renders this aspect of the respective claims obvious and the rejection is not withdrawn.

Claim Objections

7. Claims 1 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, line 23 and claim 9, lines 18-19, " , respectively," should be inserted after "communication signal" since the medium is only connected to the up-converter during transmission and the medium is only connected to the down-converter during reception. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
10. The specification as originally filed does not describe "constructing a digital circuit ... only for digital signal processing" (*emphasis added*) as recited in claim 1, lines 10-11. Page 10, line 24 - page 11, line 2 describes the baseband processor as a "digital signal processing unit." However, it does not describe it as being only for digital signal processing. Therefore, claim 1 fails to comply with the written description requirement.
11. The dependent claims are rejected under the same ground as the claim from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 12, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5,930,295 cited in the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006) in view of Antoniak (US Pub. No. 2003/0152140 A1 cited in the Office Action mailed April 21, 2008), Robinson et al. (US Patent No. 5,943,290 cited in the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006), Joshi et al. (US Patent No. 5,650,754 cited in the Office Action mailed July 17, 2007), and Dent (US Patent No. 7,133,647 cited in the Office Action mailed July 17, 2007).

14. With regard to claims 1, 4, 9 and 12, Figure 1 of Isley, Jr. et al. discloses the claimed invention including a "medium" within which a communication signal propagates through (14), an "analog circuit" (e.g. any of the components that are part of 18), a digital circuit comprising a "baseband processor" (37), an "A/D interface circuit" (28), a "D/A interface circuit" (34), a "down-converter" (22 and 26), an "up-converter" (30 and 32) and a "synthesizer" (24) coupled to a baseband processor (37). (See column 2, line 42- column 3, line 13 and column 4, lines 20-41) However, Isley, Jr. et al. does not disclose a switch for transmitting and receiving the communication signal in different time periods, the synthesizer comprised of a voltage controlled oscillator, a first ground reference, a second ground reference, and a joint clock source.

Since Antoniak discloses that a transceiver can operate as full-duplex (i.e. data transmission in both directions simultaneously) or half-duplex (i.e. data transmission in both directions but not at the same time) (see paragraph [0009]), i.e. the modes of operation are interchangeable, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the diplexer for full duplex operation in

Isley, Jr. et al. with a switch for half-duplex operation (as taught by Antoniak) in order to enable the transmission or reception of more data at the same time via half-duplex mode. Whether the transceiver operates in full-duplex or half-duplex mode does not affect the operation of the individual components (e.g. the A/D or D/A circuit, up-converter or down-converter) within the transceiver.

Furthermore, Figure 1 of Antoniak discloses a synthesizer (52) comprised of a voltage controlled oscillator. It would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a voltage controlled oscillator in the synthesizer of Isley, Jr. et al. in order to use a well-known and readily available component for generating frequency signals for the down-converter and up-converter, respectively.

Figure 1 of Robinson et al. discloses an integrated circuit with a joint clock source that provides signals to an analog circuit (12) and a digital circuit (14) wherein the analog circuit has a first ground reference (AGND), the digital circuit has a second ground reference (DGND) and a joint clock source (see XTAL in Figure 4) that supplies clock pulses to the analog circuit (including elements 42, 44 and Analog Portion in Figure 4) and the digital circuit (including elements 56, 58 and Digital Portion in Figure 4). (See column 1, lines 19-23; column 2, lines 1-26; column 3, lines 63-67; and column 4, line 65 - column 5, line 3) Since it is implicit that the transceiver/modem of Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak requires clocking signals, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Robinson et al. with Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak by implementing the transceiver

of Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak as an integrated circuit with the separate ground references (as taught by Robinson et al.) in order to reduce the size of the transceiver (via implementation as an integrated circuit) while minimizing the noise between the digital and analog portions of the integrated transceiver circuit. Furthermore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a joint clock source to provide the clock signals to the various components in Isley, Jr. et al. (e.g. the A/D converter and D/A converter in analog circuit 18) in view of Antoniak in order to minimize the number of oscillators or clock sources needed for the circuit thereby further reducing the size of the transceiver.

However, Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak and Robinson et al. does not teach connecting the joint clock source directly to the first ground reference and not connecting the joint clock source directly to the second ground reference. Joshi et al. discloses connecting a VCO to an analog ground with separate grounding for other components. (See Figure 4 and column 7, line 60 - column 8, line 8) Since VCOs are crystal oscillators (see Dent, column 1, lines 12-13), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect the crystal oscillator of Robinson et al. to the analog ground (as taught by Joshi et al.) in order to minimize noise.

15. With regard to claims 2 and 10, Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent discloses the claimed invention including an antenna and propagating the signal through the air. (See Isley, Jr. et al., "14" in Figure 1)

16. With regard to claims 7 and 15 Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent discloses the claimed invention including an analog-to-digital convertor. (See Isley, Jr. et al., "28" in Figure 1)

17. With regard to claims 8 and 16, Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent discloses the claimed invention including a digital-to-analog convertor. (See Isley, Jr. et al., "34" in Figure 1)

18. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al in view Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Hoobler (US Patent No. 7,130,337 B2 cited in the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006). Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent discloses the claimed invention except for propagating the communication signal through a wire.

Hoobler discloses that modems may be used in RF (i.e. over the air) systems or in power line systems (i.e. over a wire). (See column 3, lines 62-63) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the invention disclosed by Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniak, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent in order to reduce noise of modems in wired communication systems. Whether the modem is implemented in a RF or wired communication system does not affect the functionality or operability of the modem itself.

19. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isley, Jr. et al in view of Antoniaki, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent, as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Sorrells et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0013177 A1 cited in the Office Action mailed November 24, 2006). Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniaki, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent discloses the claimed invention except for a MAC unit.

Figure 3B of Sorrells et al. shows an integrated transceiver (322) interfacing with a MAC unit (112). Since the protocol or standard to the communication system does not affect the functionality or operation of the integrated transceiver circuit, it would have been obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method or circuit disclosed by Isley, Jr. et al. in view of Antoniaki, Robinson et al., Joshi et al. and Dent in a system that operates in accordance with such as IEEE 802.11 standards in order to optimize the performance of such a system by reducing noise caused by an integrated transceiver. Furthermore, in order for the integrated transceiver circuit to properly interface with controller of such a system, it is implicit that a MAC unit must be connected to the integrated transceiver circuit. (See Sorrells et al., paragraphs [0045]-[0046])

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betsy L. Deppe whose telephone number is (571) 272-3054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh M. Fan can be reached on (571) 272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Betsy L. Deppe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2611